UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,985	11/05/2001	Newton B. White JR.	GREN.P-001-2	4151
	7590 08/21/2007 nt Law Firm LLC - GREN	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 4850)	PATEL, NIRAV B		
FRISCO, CO 80443-4850			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2135	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/21/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DOCKET-OPPEDAHL@OPPEDAHL.COM nbw@nbwLLC.com

	a a	Application I	No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/682,985		WHITE, NEWTON I	В.		
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		Nirav Patel		2135			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
WHICHEVER IS LONGE - Extensions of time may be availa after SIX (6) MONTHS from the r - If NO period for reply is specified - Failure to reply within the set or e	TORY PERIOD FOR REPL R, FROM THE MAILING D ble under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. alling date of this communication. above, the maximum statutory period extended period for reply will, by statute ater than three months after the mailin See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS 136(a). In no event, I will apply and will ex te, cause the applicati	COMMUNICATION however, may a reply be timpire SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONE	I. nely filed the mailing date of this com D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
1) Responsive to com	munication(s) filed on <u>17 J</u>	luly 2007.			,		
2a) This action is FINA	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims		•					
4a) Of the above classified (a) Of the above classified (b) Claim(s) is/a 7) □ Claim(s) is/a	11 is/are rejected.	awn from consi					
Application Papers			İ				
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	objected to by the Examine	er.					
	l on is/are: a)☐ acc		objected to by the I	Examiner.			
Applicant may not re	quest that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be h	ield in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
· ·	g sheet(s) including the correction is objected to by the E						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
·			•	•			
Attachment/ol							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (I	PTO-892)	4)	Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
	ent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ment(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) 6)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal P	ate			

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This action is responsive to the communication filed on July 17, 2007. Claims 3, 10 and 11 are pending. Claims 1, 2 and 4-9 are canceled by the applicant and claims 3 is also amended by the applicant.
- 2. The Office would like to notify the Applicant that there has been a change in the Examiner to conduct the future examination and prosecution process of the currently pending application. The present application has been reassigned to the present examiner, who has thoroughly reviewed and searched the present invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 3, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scanlan (US Patent No. 6,029245) and in view of Ogdon et al (US Patent No. 6,161,137).

As per claims 3, 10 and 11:

Scanlan teaches configuring the server program/system to use port 80 (rather that the first port number 443) for communications using a protocol; receiving at port 80 at the web server system a first data packet that is formatted in accordance with the protocol;

Art Unit: 2135

and responding to the first data packet with a second data packet that is formatted in accordance with the protocol [Fig. 1, 2, col. 1 lines 46-60, col. 3 lines 1-6, Fig. 4].

Scanlan teaches the port 80 to communicate with the server using the various protocols [Fig. 1, 2, col. 1 lines 46-60, col. 3 lines 1-6, Fig. 4].

Ogdon teaches the port 80 to communicate with the server using the various protocols selected from the group consisting of: secure socket layer, secure sockets layer, SSL, secure hypertext transfer protocol, and HTTPS [col. 16 lines 14-31].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Ogdon with Scanlan, since one would have been motivated to provide various kinds of communication security [Ogdon, col. 14 lines 40-41].

Response to Amendment

4. Applicant's amendment filed on July 17, 2007 has been fully considered. However, upon further consideration and thorough search, a new ground(s) of rejection is based on Scanlan (US Patent No. 6,029245) and in view of Ogdon et al (US Patent No. 6,161,137). See rejections above.

Application/Control Number: 09/682,985

Art Unit: 2135

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Green et al (US 5913024) --- Secure server utilizing separate protocol stacks

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Nirav Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-5936.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm (M-F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NBP

8/13/07

/ KIM VU

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 4

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100